



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/680,012	10/07/2003	Michael Furst	FURST, M-1	4718

25889 7590 01/26/2006

WILLIAM COLLARD  
COLLARD & ROE, P.C.  
1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD  
ROSLYN, NY 11576

EXAMINER

SIMONE, CATHERINE A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1772

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

<b>Application No.</b> 10/680,012	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FURST, MICHAEL	
<b>Examiner</b> Catherine Simone	<b>Art Unit</b> 1772	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 December 2005.
- 2a)  This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b)  This action is non-final.
- 3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 1,2,7,9-11,14-26 and 28-31 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6)  Claim(s) 1,2,7,9-11,14-26 and 28-31 is/are rejected.
- 7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a)  All b)  Some \* c)  None of:  
1.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2.  Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3.  Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/16/05.
- 4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/16/05 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 9-11, 14, 22, 23 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stierli (US 4,442,148) in view of Hurst (US 3,900,102).

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Stierli discloses a film-bitumen combination comprising at least three layers (Figure 1) wherein the at least three layers comprise a bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #1) and at least two film layers made from different materials (Fig. 1, #2 and #3) and the at least two film layers comprise a first film layer and a second film layer produced from a polyolefin, polypropylene, polyamide, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) or polyacrylonitrile (see col. 3, lines 66-68 and col. 4, line 11), the first film layer being located further away from the bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #3) and inherently having a larger coefficient of elongation than the second film layer (Fig. 1, #2), since the

Art Unit: 1772

film layers are each made of materials similar to those materials of the film layers disclosed in Applicant's present Specification. However, Stierli fails to disclose a first edge of the at least two film layers projecting beyond the bituminous layer and a second edge of the at least two film layers being shorter than the bituminous layer.

Hurst teaches that it is old and well known in the art to have the first edge of a film layer (Fig. 1, #2 at 10) project beyond a bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #4) and the second edge of the film layer be shorter (Fig. 1, #2 at 8) than the bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #4; also see col. 8, line 67 to col. 9, line 3) for the purpose of forming a continuous membrane which does not contain and is not susceptible to the formation of channels for the flow or collection of water and is highly resistant to damage during installation and failure thereafter when joined with other bituminous/film strips and laminated to a substrate.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the edges of the two film layers in Stierli to have the first edge of the film layers project beyond the bituminous layer and the second edge of the film layers be shorter than the bituminous layer as suggested by Hurst in order to form a continuous membrane which does not contain and is not susceptible to the formation of channels for the flow or collection of water and is highly resistant to damage during installation and failure thereafter when joined with other bituminous/film strips and laminated to a substrate.

Regarding claim 2, the at least two film layers inherently have different coefficients of thermal expansion, since the layers are each made from materials similar to those materials of the film layers disclosed in Applicant's present Specification (see col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, lines 10-15). Regarding claim 9, note at least two film layers (Fig. 1, #2 and #3) are laminated to a bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #1) individually or together. Regarding claim 10, note the bituminous layer is coated on

Art Unit: 1772

the at least two film layers (see col. 4, lines 52-55). Regarding claim 11, note at least one film layer (Fig. 1, #2) facing the bituminous layer provides a mineral oil barrier (see col. 4, lines 6-9).

Regarding claim 22, each individual film layer is arranged in the combination in accordance with its thermal stability (see col. 4, line 65 to col. 5, line 6). Regarding claim 23, each individual film layer is arranged in the combination according to its mechanical strength (see col. 5, lines 1-6). Regarding claim 28, the bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #1) has a surface facing away from the at least two film layers (Fig. 1, #2 and #3) and a release liner is provided on the surface (Fig. 1, #4; also see col. 4, lines 28-31). Regarding claims 29 and 30, the release liner comprises release paper coated with silicone (see col. 4, lines 28-31).

4. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-11, 14 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jenkins et al. (US 5,824,401) in view of Hurst (US 3,900,102).

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Jenkins et al. discloses a film-bitumen combination comprising at least three layers (Figure 1) wherein the at least three layers comprise a bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #12) and at least two film layers made from different materials (Fig. 1, #16, #18 and #20) and the at least two film layers comprise a first film layer and a second film layer produced from a polyolefin, polypropylene, polyamide, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) or polyacrylonitrile (see col. 4, lines 8-10 and lines 62-64), the first film layer being located further away from the bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #16 and/or #18) and inherently having a larger coefficient of elongation than the second film layer (Fig. 1, #20), since the film layers are each made of materials similar to those materials of the film layers disclosed in Applicant's present Specification. However, Jenkins et al. fails to disclose a first edge of the at least two film layers projecting beyond the bituminous layer and a second edge of the at least two film layers being shorter than the bituminous layer.

Art Unit: 1772

Hurst teaches that it is old and well known in the art to have a first edge of a film layer (Fig. 1, #2 at 10) project beyond a bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #4) and the second edge of the film layer be shorter (Fig. 1, #2 at 8) than the bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #4; also see col. 8, line 67 to col. 9, line 3) for the purpose of forming a continuous membrane which does not contain and is not susceptible to the formation of channels for the flow or collection of water and is highly resistant to damage during installation and failure thereafter when joined with other bituminous/film strips and laminated to a substrate.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the edges of the two film layers in Jenkins et al. to have the first edge of the film layers project beyond the bituminous layer and the second edge of the film layers be shorter than the bituminous layer as suggested by Hurst in order to form a continuous membrane which does not contain and is not susceptible to the formation of channels for the flow or collection of water and is highly resistant to damage during installation and failure thereafter when joined with other bituminous/film strips and laminated to a substrate.

Regarding claim 2, the at least two film layers inherently have different coefficients of thermal expansion, since both layers are each made from materials similar to those materials of the film layers disclosed in Applicant's present Specification (see col. 4, lines 8-10 and 62-65).

Regarding claim 7, at least one of the at least two film layers is produced from polyethylene terephthalate and is oriented (see col. 4, lines 63-64). Regarding claim 9, the at least two film layers (Fig. 1, #18 and #20) are laminated to a bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #12) individually or together (see col. 3, lines 25-30). Regarding claim 10, the bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #12) is coated on the at least two film layers (see col. 6, lines 10-12). Regarding claim 11, at least one film layer (Fig. 1, #20) facing the bituminous layer provides a mineral oil barrier (see col. 4, lines 58-61). Regarding claim

Art Unit: 1772

22, each individual film layer is arranged in the combination in accordance with its thermal stability (see col. 5, lines 20-27). Regarding claim 23, each individual film layer is arranged in the combination according to its mechanical strength (see col. 5, lines 20-27). Regarding claim 24, note a tie layer or an adhesive disposed between two adjacent layers of the at least two film layers (see col. 5, lines 39-42). Regarding claim 25, note further a barrier layer against mineral oils, oxygen or UV radiation disposed between two adjacent layers of the at least two film layers (see col. 4, lines 47-56). Regarding claim 26, the barrier layer comprises a layer of lacquer (see col. 4, lines 62-66).

4. Claims 1, 2, 7, 9-11, 14-16, 18, 20-26 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiercinski et al. (US 5,687,517) in view of Hurst (US 3,900,102).

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Wiercinski et al. discloses a film-bitumen combination comprising at least three layers (Figure 2) wherein the at least three layers comprise a bituminous layer and at least two film layers made from different materials (Fig. 2, #22 and #22A and see col. 6, lines 58-64) and the at least two film layers comprise a first film layer and a second film layer produced from a polyolefin, polypropylene, polyamide, polyethylene terephthalate (PET) or polyacrylonitrile (see col. 4, lines 31-36 and col. 6, lines 7-10 and lines 62-64), the first film layer being located further away from the bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #14 and Fig. 2, #22 and/or #22A) and inherently having a larger coefficient of elongation than the second film layer (see col. 6, lines 60-64), since the layers are each made up of materials similar to those materials of the film layers disclosed in Applicant's present Specification. However, Wiercinski et al. fails to disclose a first edge of the at least two film layers projecting beyond the bituminous layer and a second edge of the at least two film layers being shorter than the bituminous layer.

Hurst teaches that it is old and well known in the art to have a first edge of a film layer (Fig. 1, #2 at 10) project beyond a bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #4) and the second edge of the film layer be

Art Unit: 1772

shorter (Fig. 1, #2 at 8) than the bituminous layer (Fig. 1, #4; also see col. 8, line 67 to col. 9, line 3) for the purpose of forming a continuous membrane which does not contain and is not susceptible to the formation of channels for the flow or collection of water and is highly resistant to damage during installation and failure thereafter when joined with other bituminous/film strips and laminated to a substrate.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the edges of the two film layers in Wiercinski et al. to have the first edge of the film layers project beyond the bituminous layer and the second edge of the film layers be shorter than the bituminous layer as suggested by Hurst in order to form a continuous membrane which does not contain and is not susceptible to the formation of channels for the flow or collection of water and is highly resistant to damage during installation and failure thereafter when joined with other bituminous/film strips and laminated to a substrate.

Regarding claim 2, the at least two film layers inherently have different coefficients of thermal expansion (see col. 3, lines 49-53 and col. 6, lines 61-64), since the layers are each made up of materials similar to those materials of the film layers disclosed in Applicant's present Specification. Regarding claim 7, the PET layer is oriented (see col. 4, lines 62-63). Regarding claim 9, the at least two film layers (Fig. 2, #22 and #22A) are laminated to a bituminous layer (Fig. 2, #12) individually or together. Regarding claim 10, the bituminous layer (Fig. 2, #12; see col. 5, lines 58-60) is coated on the at least two film layers (Fig. 2, #22 and #22A). Regarding claim 11, note at least one film layer facing the bituminous layer provides a mineral oil barrier (see col. 6, lines 59-64). Regarding claim 15, a surface of a side of the combination facing away from the bituminous layer has been treated to have non-slip properties (see col. 4, lines 1-16). Regarding claim 16, the non-slip treatment is carried out by means of coating (see col. 6, lines 46-50). Regarding claim 18, the non-



Art Unit: 1772

slip treatment is carried out by means of at least partial embossing of the surface (see col. 3, lines 62-65). Regarding claim 20, the non-slip treatment is provided by a coextruded syndiotactic polystyrene film (see col. 4, line 37). Regarding claim 21, the non-slip treatment is provided by a thermoplastic elastomer with a metallocene complex (see col. 4, line 37 and col. 6, lines 50-57). Regarding claim 22, each individual film layer is arranged in the combination in accordance with its thermal stability (see col. 5, lines 14-17). Regarding claim 23, each individual film layer is arranged in the combination according to its mechanical strength (see col. 5, lines 14-17). Regarding claim 24, note a tie layer or an adhesive disposed between two adjacent layers of the at least two film layers (see col. 5, lines 18-19). Regarding claim 25, note a barrier layer against mineral oils disposed between two adjacent layers of the at least two film layers (see col. 6, lines 59-64). Regarding claim 26, the barrier layer comprises a layer of lacquer (see col. 6, lines 60-64). Regarding claim 28, the bituminous layer (Fig. 3, #12) has a surface facing away from the at least two film layers (Fig. 3, #22 and #22A) and a release liner is provided on the surface (Fig. 3, #40). Regarding claims 29 and 30, the release liner is siliconized paper (see col. 3, lines 1-2).

5. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiercinski et al. (US 5,687,517) in view of Hurst (US 3,900,102) and further in view of Zickell et al. (US 4,992,315).

Wiercinski et al. and Hurst teach the film-bitumen combination as shown above. However, Wiercinski et al. fails to disclose the non-slip coating and the embossing being shorter at least along one edge of the combination. Zickell et al. teaches that it is old and well-known in the art to have an embossed non-slip film (Fig. 3, #28) being shorter along at least one edge of a film-bitumen combination for the purpose of providing a small portion having slip resistance where one can stand to reduce the risk of falling (see col. 4, lines 63-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

Art Unit: 1772

ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the non-slip coating and embossing in Wiercinski et al. to be shorter at least along one edge of the combination as suggested by Zickell et al. in order to provide only a portion that is slip resistant where one can stand to reduce the risk of falling.

6. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stierli (US 4,442,148) or Wiercinski et al. (US 5,687,517) in view of Hurst (US 3,900,102) and further in view of Kalkanoglu (US 4,757,652).

Stierli, Wiercinski et al. and Hurst teach the film-bitumen combination as shown above. However, Stierli and Wiercinski et al. each fail to disclose the release liner having several sections. Kalkanoglu teaches that it is old and well-known in the analogous art to have a release liner with several sections for the purpose of allowing the material to be flopped back, so that one side can be stuck, and then the other side can be flopped down and stuck (see col. 1, lines 5-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have modified the release liner in either Stierli or Wiercinski et al. to have several sections as suggested by Kalkanoglu in order to allow the material to be flopped back, so that one side can be stuck, and then the other side can be flopped down and stuck.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 7, 9-11, 14-26 and 28-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Art Unit: 1772

**Conclusion**


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Catherine Simone whose telephone number is (571)272-1501. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Catherine A. Simone  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1772  
January 22, 2006



HAROLD PYON  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

1772

1/23/06